



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

VIII.—*On the Date of the Prometheus of Aeschylus.*

By T. D. SEYMOUR,

PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN WESTERN RESERVE COLLEGE.

All efforts to determine the date of the representation of the Prometheus Bound have failed to discover convincing arguments. Concerning the date of no other Greek drama do scholars differ so widely. While Schoemann and others hold this to be the earliest of the extant plays, Moriz Schmidt classes it with the Rhesus as the rear-guard, the stragglers—*der Nachtrab*—of Greek tragedy. To Westphal and Dindorf the character of the metres seems to point to a late epoch in tragic art; to Wecklein the careful formation of the trimeters seems to indicate that the play was written before the Persians. Gottfried Hermann believes that only two actors were employed, and assigns the play to an early date; Karl Otfried Müller thinks that three actors were necessary, and that the play is one of the poet's latest works, produced after Sophocles had introduced the third actor. Donaldson selects for the date of representation "the year 464 B. C., when the news would reach Athens that Themistocles had entered the service of the Persian king. The warrior of Marathon and Salamis, and the friend of Aristides, would at such a time with peculiar force utter that abomination of treason, which the poet puts into the mouth of his chorus." Who, unacquainted with the play, would suppose that this "abomination of treason" referred to lines 1067 fg. :

μετὰ τοῦδ' ὅ τι χρεὶ πάσχειν ἐξέλω
τοὺς προδότας γὰρ μισεῖν ἔμαθον,
κοῦκ ἔστι νόσος
τῇσδ' ἦντιν' ἀπέπτυσσά μ' ἄλλον!

It is indeed childish, as Haupt says, to seek or accept in the plays of Aeschylus or Sophocles allusions to the politics of their time. This notion of Donaldson is shown in its full absurdity by the equally improbable hypothesis of a later English writer,

that this play was intended, on the other hand, as a glorification of Themistocles. In that event it would be best dated before the Persians.

All the above arguments are based upon the metre, the language, and the construction of the play, or upon some uncertain political allusion. From the very nature of the arguments and the known facts of the poet's life they are inconclusive. According to the Marmor Parium, Aeschylus was born Ol. LXIII 4, 525 B. C., and contended with Pratinas Ol. LXX, 500 B. C. With the latter date agrees the statement at the beginning of the *βίος Αἰσχύλου*—*νέος δὲ ἤρξατο τῶν τραγωδιῶν*. The Persians, the first tragedy of which the date is fixed, was represented in the archonship of Meno, 472 B. C.; the Oresteian Trilogy, the last presented by Aeschylus at Athens, was put upon the stage in the archonship of Philocles, 458 B. C. These fourteen years were by no means the *Lehrjahre* of Aeschylus. At the beginning of this period he had been writing tragedies for twenty-eight years, and was probably then fifty-three years old. While he was ready to accept suggestions from his younger rival, Sophocles, and modify his stage arrangements, we have no reason to suppose that he materially changed his style of composition or metres. The history of the Athenian stage of that period is by no means clear. We do not know even whether the third actor was first introduced by Aeschylus or Sophocles. Much less are we informed as to the date of other innovations. We have too few of our author's works to justify us in the assertion, from internal evidence, that one play belongs to his fifty-fifth year and another to his sixty-fifth year. We do not know what is accidental in the play and what belongs to the period of development and work. The simplicity of language and construction of the Prometheus may be explained as natural to the earliest age of tragedy, or as the result of Sophoclean influence.

A comparison with the Suppliants has been suggested as affording an indication of the date. In both plays the fortunes of Io are referred to in similar language, and the return of the Danaids to Greece is alluded to in the Prometheus. We may compare Suppliants 29: τὸν Θηλυγενῆ στόλον,

38: λέκτρων ὧν Θέμις εἴργει, 312: καὶ Ζεὺς γ' ἐφάπτωρ χειρὶ φιλύει γόνον, 46: Ζητὸς ἔφαψιν· ἐπωνυμία δ' ἐπεκραίνετο μόρσιμος αἰὼν | εὐλόγως, "Επαφον δ' ἐγέννασεν, 314: "Επαφος ἀληθῶς ῥυσίων ἐπώνυμος, 179: αἰνῶ φυλάξαι τὰμ' ἔπη δελτουμένας, 223: ἐσμός ὡς πελειάδων | ἴζεσθε κίρκων τῶν ὁμοπτέρων φόβῳ | ἐχθρῶν ὁμαίμων καὶ μαινότων γένος, 253: γένος Πελασγῶν τήνδε κερπύεται χθόνα, 304: πανόπτην οἰοβουκόλον, . . μύωπα κινήτηριον, . οἴστρον, . . μακρῷ δρόμῳ, 311: Κάνωβον κατὰ Μέμφιν ἵκετο, 320: πεντηκοντάπαις, 467: ὠμμάτωσα, 540 fg.: Ἴω | οἴστρῳ ἐρεσσομένα | φεύγει ἀμαρτίνοος, | πολλὰ βροτῶν διαμειβομένα | φῦλα κτλ. with Prometheus 846:

ἔστιν πόλις Κάνωβος ἐσχάτη χθονὸς,
ἐνταῦθα δὴ σε Ζεὺς τίθησιν ἔμφορα
[ἐπαφῶν ἀταρβεῖ χειρὶ καὶ θιγῶν μόνον].
ἐπώνυμον δὲ τῶν Διὸς γέννημ' ἄφῶν
τέξεις κελαινὸν "Επαφον, δς καρπώσεται
ὄσπην πλατύρρους Νεῖλος ἀρδεύει χθόνα·
πέμπτῃ δ' ἀπ' αὐτοῦ γέννα πεντηκοντάπαις
πάλιν πρὸς "Αργος οὐχ ἔκουσ' ἐλεύσεται
θηλύσπορος, φεύγουσα συγγενῇ γάμον
ἀνεψιῶν· οἱ δ' ἐπτοημένοι φρένας,
κίρκοι πελειῶν οὐ μακρὰν λελειμμένοι,
ἥζουσι θηρεύοντες οὐ θηρασίμους | γάμους κτλ.

Also 789: ἦν ἐγγράφου σὺ μνήμοσιν δέλτοις φρενῶν, 569: μυριωπὸν εἰσορῶσα βούταν, 675: μύωπι χρισθεῖς' ἔμμανεῖ σκιρτήματι, 580: οἴστρηλάτῳ δὲ δέϊματι, 591: τοὺς ὑπερμήκεις δρόμους, 499: ἐξωμμάτωσα, 709 fg. and 792 fg., a list of the many tribes through which Io must pass before she finds rest.

Aeschylus shrank no more than Homer from the repetition of a thought in similar words, and might be as willing to give the substance of his Suppliants in a later tragedy as to amplify into a new tragedy the sketch given in the Prometheus. It is not easy, then, to draw from this comparison any definite conclusion as to priority of composition. Moreover the exact date of the Suppliants is unknown.

A surer criterion we may perhaps find in a comparison with the works of Pindar, of which Aeschylus was a careful student, as he was a student of the other lyric poets and of Homer, and did not hesitate to borrow from Phrynichus. He trans-

ferred ἐς τὸ καλὸν ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦ. His originality was so great and undisputed that he could afford to borrow. We think no less of Milton's genius when other nations claim the original plan of the *Paradise Lost*, and when we find in Spenser the germs of some famous passages. The great Teutonic poet is in our time not accused of lack of originality, though Greene claimed that Shakespeare was decking himself in borrowed plumes. So Aeschylus' genius is manifested in all the changes which he made in the plan of the *Phoenissae*. He gave the prologue of the *Persians* (if it may be called a prologue, in the *parodos*) to the chorus of old peers, and not to the eunuch dusting the throne. Wisdom was shown also in the constitution of the chorus from Persian peers, and not from Tyrian women brought to Susa without sufficient motive. It is an evidence of our different estimate of Euripides that we are not quite sure how much of the *Medea's* beauty is due to Neophron.

As then the *Persians*, perhaps the earliest tragedy which has come down to us, bears witness to the willingness of Aeschylus to study and profit by the works of other poets, and as he himself said that his dramas were but scraps from the sumptuous banquets of Homer, we need not be prejudiced against the thought that he not only studied but borrowed from his great contemporary.

The resemblance between the most tragic of lyric poets and the most lyric of tragic poets has been often noted. Born in the same lustrum, educated in the schools of the same city, though widely separated by their different relations to the wars for the freedom of Greece, and differing in some minor points, as in their treatment of the strife of the Gods, they were alike in their ethical views, in their sublime, rugged, and sometimes grandiose style, and, as we should expect, were alike in their use of words and constructions. Thus a comparison with Pindar has not only restored ἀπλάτου for the ἀπλήστον of the MSS. in *Prometheus* 371, but has explained many other passages.

Both poets use the present tense in predictions. So *Prom.* 513: δῶαις τε καμψθεῖς ὧδε δεσμὰ φυγγάνω, 848: ἐνταῦθα δὴ σε Ζεὺς

τίθησιν ἔμφρονα. Agam. 126: χρόνῳ μὲν ἀγρεῖ Πριάμου πόλιν ἄδε κέλευθος, Pind. Ol. viii, 42: Πέργαμος ἀμφὶ τεαίς, ἥρωες, χερὸς ἐργασίαις ἀλίσκεττα, Pyth. iv, 48: τότε γὰρ μεγάλας | ἐξανίστανται Λακεδαίμονος.

The emphatic position of the proper name at the end of the sentence is not indeed peculiar to Aeschylus among the tragic poets, but with e. g. Prom. 612: πυρὸς βροτοῖς δοτῆρ' ὄρᾳ Προμηθεῖα, we may compare Ol. vii, 13: τὰν ποντίαν | ὑμνέων παῖδ' Ἀφροδίτας, Ἀελιοῦ τε νόμφαν, Ῥόδον, Pyth. vi, 30: ἐναρίμβροτον | ἀναμειναις στράταρχον Αἰθιοπῶν | Μέμνονα, Isth. iv, 53: Θηβᾶν ἀπο Καδμείᾳν μορφὰν βραχὺς, ψυχὰν δ' ἄκαμπτος, προσπαλίσων ἦλθ' ἀνὴρ | . . υἱὸς Ἀλκμήνας.

Common to both poets is the use of a noun as an adjective. Agam. 403: ἀσπίστορας κλόρους, Isth. i, 23: ὀπλίταις δρόμοις. Both have the figurative use of ποιμήν. Supp. 767: ναῶν ποιμένες, Ol. x, 88: ἐπεὶ πλοῦτος ὁ λαχὼν ποιμένα | ἐπακτὸν ἀλλότριον | θνάσκοντι στυγερώτατος, Nem. viii, 6: ποιμένες . . | Κυπρίας δώρων. So with πρύτανις, Prom. 169: μακάρων πρύτανις. Pyth. vi, 24: βαρύνωπαν στεροπαῖν κεραινῶν τε πρύτανιν. Both poets use αἶσα frequently and in various constructions. Ol. ix, 42: Διὸς αἶσα, Pyth. iv, 107: κατ' αἶσαν, Pyth. viii, 13: παρ' αἶσαν, Frag. i, 2: σὺν θεῶν αἶσα, Supp. 545: ἐν αἶσᾳ, 79: παρ' αἶσαν, Choeph. 927: πατρὸς αἶσα. In Pyth. x, 66: φιλέων φιλέοντ', ἄγων ἄγοντα, the ὁμοιοκάταρκτα remind of Prom. 19: ἄκοντά σ' ἄκων, 29: θεὸς θεῶν, 192: σπεύδων σπεύδοντι, 218: ἐκόνθ' ἐκόντι, 276: πρὸς ἄλλοσ' ἄλλον, 671: ἄκουσαν ἄκων.

Both fancy the appositional use of ποινή and similar words. Supp. 626: εὐχὰς ἀγαθὰς, ἀγαθῶν ποινάς. Isth. iii, 7: εὐκλέων δ' ἔργων ἀποινα χορὴ μὲν ὑμνῆσαι τὸν ἐσλόν κτλ.

Constructions which were later less frequent were not uncommon in these two poets. Such is περί with a dative of cause. Persians 695: σέβομαι δ' ἀντία λέξαι | σέθεν ἀρχαίῳ περὶ τάρβει, Pyth. v, 58:λέοντες περὶ δέϊματι φύγον.

We may further compare Pers. 1056: γενεῖον πέρθε λευκήρη τρίχα and Pyth. ix, 80: Εὐρυσθέος ἐπεὶ κεφαλὰν | ἔπραθε φασγάου ἀκμῇ. Agam. 113: οἰωνῶν βασιλεύς and Ol. xiii, 21: οἰωνῶν βασιλέα. Supp. 998: τέρειν' ὀπώρα (of the maidens) δ' εὐφύλακτος οὐδαμῶς is illustrated by Isth. ii, 4: Ἀφροδίτας | εὐθρόνον μνάσσειραν ἀδίσταν ὀπώραν, Prom. 155: δεσμοῖς ἀλύτοις ἀγρώως πελάσας,

by Pyth. iv, 227 : τοὺς ἀγαγὼν ζεύγλα πέλασσειν. Examples of this similarity might be indefinitely multiplied.

But not infrequently we find coincidence of thought or language, which seems to be the result of conscious imitation, and with perhaps only a single exception, we find from the known dates of ode and tragedy that it is Aeschylus who borrows. We may perhaps regard as accidental the similar allusions to the punishment of Aesculapius, Ag. 1022, Pyth. iii, 55 ; and to the crime of Ixion, Eum. 718 (πρωτοκτόνοισι προστροπαῖς Ἰξίονος), Pyth. ii, 32 (ἐμφύλιον αἷμα πρότιστος οὐκ ἄτερ τέχνας ἐπέμξε θνατοῖς) ; and the same figure of a cock fighting on his own dunghill, Agam. 1671, Eum. 861 (but in a suspected passage), Ol. xii, 14. In other cases, however, the connection is more evident.

Pindar, Pyth. viii, 95 : ἐπάμεροι· τί δέ τις ; τί δ' οὐ τις ; σκιᾶς ὄναρ | ἄνθρωπος was in the mind of Aeschylus, we may well believe, when he wrote Agam. 839 : ὀμιλίας κάτοπτρον, εἰδῶλον σκιᾶς, unless we accept the possibility that both are later than Aesch. fr. 390 : τὸ γὰρ βρότειον σπέρμ' ἐφ' ἡμέραν φρονεῖ, | καὶ πιστὸν οὐδὲν μᾶλλον ἢ καπνοῦ σκιά. The resemblance to Pindar is perhaps as close, though not so obvious, in Prometheus 545 fg. :

φέρ' ὅπως ἄχαρις χάρις, ὦ φίλος· εἰπὲ ποῦ τίς ἀλκά ;
 τίς ἐφαμερίων ἄρηξις ; οὐδ' ἐδέρχθης
 ὀλιγοδρανίαν ἄκυκιν
 ἰσόνειρον, ᾗ τὸ φωτῶν
 ἀλατὸν (δέδετα ins. Hermann) γένος ἐμπεποδισμένον ;

and 448 : ὀνειράτων | ἀλίγκιοι μορφαῖσι. That chorus of the Prometheus, 545 fg., it may be remarked in passing, has been noticed by Heinrich Schmidt for its Pindaric form ; and in the first strophe we find the dactylo-epitritic measure which prevails in Pindar, but which is found in Aeschylus only there and in the same play 887 fg., and perhaps once in the Suppliants.

But among the more specific points of resemblance between odes of Pindar and the Prometheus of Aeschylus, the most remarkable is the description of the hundred-headed monster, Typhon, Pyth. i, 15 fg. :

ὅς τ' ἐν αἰνᾷ Ταρτάρῳ κείται, θεῶν πολέμιος,
 Τυφῶς ἑκατοντακάρανος· τόν ποτε
 Κιλικίον θρέψεν πολυνύμμον ἄντρον· νῦν γε μάν . .
 Σικελία τ' αὐτοῦ πῆζει στέρνα λαχνάεντα· κίων δ' οὐρανία συνέχει,
 νυφόμεσ' Αἴτνα . . τᾶς ἐρεύγονται μὲν ἀπλάτου πυρὸς ἀγνόταται,
 ἐκ μυχῶν παγαί κτλ.

The Prosodion to Aetnaean Zeus, of which we have fragments 92, 93, seems to have been written about the time of the first Pythian ode, when Hiero honored in every way the city which he founded on the site of Catana: Κεῖνψ μὲν Αἴτνα δεσμός ὑπερ-
 φιάλος | ἀμφίκειται.

. . ἀλλ' οἶος ἄπλατον κεραΐζεις θεῶν
 Τυφῶν' ἑκατοντακάρανον ἀνάγκη, Ζεῦ πάτερ,
 ἐν Ἀρίμοις ποτέ.

The monster is mentioned also in Pyth. viii, 15: βία δὲ καὶ
 μέγалаυχον ἔσφαλεν ἐν χρόνῳ. | Τυφῶς Κίλιξ ἑκατόγκρανος οὐ νιν ἄλυξεν.
 Here we see that Typhon was not yet Aetnaean, and Strabo intimates that Pindar was the first to transfer him to Sicily.*

With these passages we have to compare Prometheus
 351 fg.:

τὸν γηγενῇ τε Κιλικίων οἰκήτορα
 ἄντρον ἰδὼν ᾤκτειρα, δάϊον τέρας
 ἑκατογκράρανον πρὸς βίαν χειροῦμενον
 Τυφῶνα θοῶρον, πᾶσιν ὃς ἀνέστη θεοῖς κτλ.

364: κείται στενωποῦ πλησίον θαλασσίου
 ἱπούμενος ὄλζαισιν Αἰτναίαις ὕπο,
 . . ἐνθεν ἐκραγήσονται ποτε
 ποταμοὶ πυρὸς δάπτοντες ἀγροίαις γνάθοις
 τῆς καλλικάρπου Σικελίας λευροῦς γῶας . .

371: θερμοῖς ἀπλάτου βέλεσι πυρπνόου ζάλης.

That the resemblance here is beyond the workings of chance is evident; but which is the original? Perhaps the answer to this question might be left to the scholarly instinct of each

* In Hesiod, Theogony 860, for αἰδονῆς, the reading of the mss., Schoemann conjectured Ἀίτνης. This has been received into the text by Flach. But, besides the uncertainty of the emendation, the passage in the Theogony is quite distinct in style from the rest of that work, and may be of later date than Pindar and Aeschylus.

reader. Schoemann says that Aeschylus' description of the eruption might have been written if the poet had never seen Sicily. It would hardly have had its present form if he had never seen or heard the first Pythian ode of Pindar. We may be supported in our decision by an examination of the ode. Hiero of Syracuse had gained the victory in the chariot-race at Delphi. Six years or possibly only two years before, he had driven out the inhabitants of Catana and had founded there a Doric city, named from the mountain on whose slope it lay. He was therefore to be celebrated as Aetnaean, and the glory of the city Aetna is the real subject of the ode. The poet begins with an address to the lyre: *Χρυσέα φόρμιγξ, Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ ἰοπλοκάμων σύνδικον Μοισῶν κτέανον*. "The minstrels obey thy biddings. Thou dost quench the thunderbolt of ever-living fire. The eagle, ἀρχὸς οἰωνῶν, sleeps on the sceptre of Zeus. Thy notes soothe the hearts of the divinities. But all the creatures which Zeus does not love are frightened at the voice of the Pierides." ὅσσα δὲ μὴ πεφίληκε Ζεὺς, ἀτύζονται βοᾶν | Πιερίδων αἰόντα, γᾶν τε καὶ πόντον κατ' ἀμαιμάκετον, | ὅς τ' ἐν αἰνᾷ Ταρτάρῳ κείται κτλ. From this creature who Αἴτνας ἐν μέλαμφύλλοις δέδεσται πορυφαῖς, the transition is natural and easy to the mountain and the city named from it, which, with the founder's victory, is to be celebrated in the ode.

It is obvious that Typhon is an essential link in Pindar's chain. He is not introduced as a mere ornament or illustration, or as Philoctetes, 52 fg., to exalt the Syracusan king. Let us now look at the parallel passage in the tragedy. After speaking of Atlas, Prometheus continues: τὸν γηγενῆ τε Κίλικίῳ οἰκίτορα κτλ. At the conclusion of this description, Prometheus abruptly changes the subject by addressing Oceanus:

σὺ δ' οὐκ ἄπειρος οὐδ' ἐμοῦ διδυσκάλου | χηρῆζεις.

I am so far from agreeing with Wecklein that the mention of Atlas is only a transition to the description of Typhon and the eruption of Aetna, that the mention of Atlas seems to be complete in itself, while Typhon is only introduced to give a local allusion which would be appreciated best at the court of Syracuse. For an Athenian audience Typhon did not stand on the same footing as the Titan Atlas, and the Athenians

felt no particular interest in the eruption of Aetna. It is to be noted, moreover, that in the epode of the following chorus, Typhon is ignored and Atlas alone referred to in *μόνον δὴ πρόσθεν ἄλλον ἐν πόνοις | . . . εἰσιδόμεν κτλ.* This could hardly be, if it were true that the Titan was mentioned only as a transition to the monster. Considering then, the necessity of the myth to this ode of Pindar's, and the loose and episodical way in which it is introduced in the tragedy, I think we may find some confirmation of our opinion that the Prometheus was written after the ode, which latter is dated by Boeckh 474 B. C., but by Bergk assigned to 470 B. C.

In the second Pythian ode, which was composed for Hiero, probably 477 or 476 B. C., we find :

93. *φέρειν δ' ἐλαφρῶς ἐπανχένιον λαβόντα ζυγόν
ἀρήγει· ποτὶ κέντρον δέ τοι
λακτισδόμεν τέλεθει
ὀλοσθηρὸς οἶμος.*

We find the same thought in Prometheus 322: *οὔκουν ἔμοιγε χρόμενος δόδασκάλω | πρὸς κέντρα κῶλον ἐκτενεῖς*, and Agamemnon 1624: *πρὸς κέντρα μὴ λάκτιζε*. Euripides uses the expression twice; once in Bacchae 795: *πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζοιμι θνητὸς ὢν θεῶ*, and again Frag. 607: *πρὸς κέντρα μὴ λάκτιζε τοῖς κρατοῦσι σου*. By the time of Euripides it was becoming proverbial, as it was a mere maxim in the time of St. Paul. In this connection it is to be remembered that in Acts ix, 5 the words *σκληρόν σοι πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν* are not found in the Greek mss., but are inserted in the *textus receptus* from Acts xxvi, 14. In the latter passage St. Paul is giving to Agrippa an account in the Greek language of the vision and the voice which addressed him "in the Hebrew tongue." The Apostle, then, undoubtedly gave a free translation, in a current Greek proverb, of the words which he had heard. Commentators have been, perhaps, too hasty in assuming that this was already such a common expression in the time of Pindar and Aeschylus. In this they have neglected the *φέρειν δ' ἐλαφρῶς κτλ.* It would not be in the manner of Pindar to develop the figure as he has, if it were not his own fresh expression.

In the same second Pythian ode, *ἐν θ' ἄρματα πεισιχάλινα*

καταΰενυγνύη | σθένης ἱππιον, verse 11, reminds of Prometheus 465: ὕφ' ἄρμα τ' ἡγαγον φιληνίους | ἱππους.

In the same ode, verse 34, in speaking of Ixion's passion for Hera, the poet says: χερὶ δὲ κατ' αὐτὸν αἰεὶ παντὸς ὀφθαλμοῦ μέτρον. The same thought is expressed in Prometheus 890: ὥς τὸ κηρέυσαι καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἀρριστεύει μακρῶ.

With a hyporchema written for Hiero at the same time as this second Pythian ode, Frag. 105: Νομάδεσσι γὰρ ἐν Σκύθαις ἀλάτται Στόάτων, | ὅς ἀμαξοφόρητον οἶκον οὐ πέπαται, may be compared Prometheus 709-710:

Σκύθας δ' ἀφίξει νομάδας οἱ πλεκτιάς στέγας
πεδάροισι ναλοῦσ' ἐπ' ἐδκύκλοις ὄχοις.

This last seems like a dramatic development of ἀμαξοφόρητον οἶκον.

It is instructive, also, to compare the prophecy of Themis concerning Thetis, as given in the two poets. Isth. viii, 34 fg.:

εἴπε δ' εὐβουλος (cf. Prom. 18: ὀρθοβούλου Θέμιδος) ἐν μέσοισι Θέμις,
εἶνεκεν πεπραμένον ἦν, φέρετρός κ' ἐγὼ γόνον ἄνακτα πατρός τεκεῖν
ποντίαν θεόν, ὅς κεραυνοῦ τε κρέσσον ἄλλο βέλος
διώξει χερὶ τριύδοντός τ' ἀμαιμακέτου, Διὶ δαμαζομένην
ἢ Διὸς παρ' ἀδελφεοῖσιν.

This evidently is the prophecy to which reference is made in the Prometheus 908:

τοῖον ἐξαγύεται
γάμον γαμεῖν, ὅς αὐτὸν ἐκ τυραννίδος
θρόνων τ' αἴστων ἐκβαλεῖ κτλ.

920:

τοῖον παλαιστὴν νῦν παρὰ σκευάσσεται
ἐπ' αὐτὸς ἀντὶ, δυσμαχώτατον τέρας·
ὅς δ' ἡ κεραυνοῦ κρείσσον' ἐνρήσει φλόγα,
βροντῆς θ' ὑπερβάλλοντα καρτερὸν κτύπον·
θαλασσίαν τε γῆς τινάκτειραν νόσον
τρίαιναν, αἰχμήν τ' ἡν Πησειδῶνος, σκεδᾷ.

The Titaness Themis is referred to in the tragedy once and again as the source of her son's knowledge of futurity, and we notice that Aeschylus adds two lines which did not affect the danger of Zeus. The poet had in mind Pindar's ἢ Διὸς παρ' ἀδελφεοῖσιν.

It is noteworthy that all but the last of these Pindaric passages to which parallels have been found in the Prometheus are from the odes and the hyporchema which were composed for Hiero of Syracuse. For this there is no easier explanation than that the tragedy also was prepared for the court of Syracuse. No other reason appears why the Prometheus should be fuller of Pindaric expressions and allusions than the Agamemnon. This is especially true of the Typhon episode. This monster is mentioned again in the Seven against Thebes, but the name is not found in any other Attic writer, except once in the Phaedrus of Plato, Aristophanes' Clouds 336, and, according to Hesychius, in a lost play of Sophocles. Neither in these passages just mentioned, nor in Herodotus, is he brought into connection with Sicily. As the description of the Aetnean eruption serves a dramatic purpose, to show the prophetic power of Prometheus, the prediction concerning the Amazons, verse 723 fg., has been compared with it. This prediction is very brief, however, and the more natural as the Amazons were far more interesting than Typhon to Aeschylus as an Athenian.

That Pindar should have seized upon the story of Typhon is natural. Sicily was colonized after the beginning of the historical period. The island is not rich in myths, and strangely enough, in all his Sicilian odes Pindar never mentions the Cyclops. Moreover the Syracusan tyrant was not descended from the ancient heroes. When an Aeginetan received the victor's crown the poet had an *embarras de richesse* in the justice and honor of Aeacus, in the exploits of Telamon and marriage of Peleus, and the brave deeds of Ajax and Hector. When Diagoras of Rhodes was victor we have the story of the first appearance of the island, and the betrothal of the island's nymph to the sun. For Thebes cf. Frag. 29 :

Ἴσμηνὸν ἢ χρυσαλάκατον Μελίαν,
ἢ Κάδμον, ἢ σπαρτῶν ἱερὸν γένος ἀνδρῶν,
ἢ τὰν κυνὰ μινυκα Θήβαν,
ἢ τὸ πάντολμον σθένος Ἡρακλῆος,
ἢ τὰν Διωνύσου πολυγαθὰ τιμάν,
ἢ γάμον λευκωλένου Ἀρμονίας ὑμνήσομεν;

This abundance of mythical subjects was not to be found in Sicily, and thus Aeschylus' conscious imitation is more natural and obvious. In the prediction concerning the eruption of Aetna, in the mention of the "smooth fields of fertile Sicily," and of the monster, where, as Wecklein says, the poet speaks rather than Prometheus; in the warning not to kick against the pricks; in the exhortation to marry in one's own rank; in the Scythian wheeled houses—in all this, Hiero heard allusions to his victories, and to the Epinikia of Pindar in his honor—allusions which were well understood by his court and the Greeks generally. We cannot suppose that these allusions were introduced for an audience at Gela or at Athens.

The abundance of nautical metaphors in the Suppliants indicates to Teuffel the possible Sicilian origin of that play. There is no lack of such figures in the Prometheus; e. g. 149: *οιακονόμοι*, 182: *δέδια γὰρ ἀμφὶ σαῖς τέχαις | πᾶ ποτε τῶνδε πόνων | χορή* *σε τέγμα κέλσαντ' ἐσιδεῖν*, 190: *τὴν δ' ἀτέραμνον στορέσας ὀργήν*, 515: *οιακοστρόφος*, 1001: *ὀχλεῖς μάτην με κύμ' ὅπως παρηγορῶν*, 1015: *οἶός σε χειμῶν καὶ κακῶν τρικυμία | ἔπεισ' ἀφυκτος*. But in neither, perhaps, do we find more sea words and phrases than in the Seven against Thebes, which begins:

Κάδμου πολῖται, χορή λέγειν τὰ καίρια
ὅστις φυλάσσει προῶγος ἐν πρόμνη πόλεως
οἶακα νομῶν,

and ends,

μετὰ γὰρ μόκρας καὶ Διὸς ἰσχὺν
ὅδε Καδμείων ἦρξε πόλιν
μᾶνατραπῆναι μηδ' ἀλλοδαπῶν
κύματι φωτῶν κατακλυσθῆν.

From this then we draw no conclusion. Aeschylus has merely proved himself what Dionysus was not, a true *Σαλαμίνιος*. I would lay no stress either upon the Sicilianism of *ἄρμοι* of verse 615 of the Prometheus.

I would rest the argument upon the comparison with Pindar. This alone makes it probable that the tragedy was composed in Sicily, and after the first Pythian ode and the hyporchema which Pindar wrote for Hiero. This ode is in honor of the chariot victory which was gained at the 29th Pythiad. Accord-

ing to Bergk and the earlier authorities, who reckon from the first στεφανίτης ἀγών in Ol. XLIX 3, this would be in the early autumn of 470 B. C. Boeckh, however, reckons from the establishment of the ἀγών χρηματίτης, and his date for the ode, 474 B. C., is adopted by Dissen, Schmidt, and others. This fixes the latter part of 474 or 470 B. C. as the earliest date possible for the tragedy. But in the Spring of 472 Aeschylus produced the Persians at Athens. It has been suggested that it was the fame of that play which gained for Aeschylus an invitation to the court of Syracuse. The Persians would naturally arouse the tyrant's interest. He loved to hear the conflict with the Carthaginians, in which he had a share, compared with the battle of Salamis. As the conflicts were near in time, they were alike in results. It does not surprise us, then, to find Himera and Salamis united in that first Pythian ode. Aeschylus reproduced (φασὶν ἀναδιδάξαι τοὺς Πέρσας ἐν Συκελίᾳ) his Persians on the stage of Syracuse. We may well believe that it was during this visit that he composed the Aetnean Women and the Prometheus Bound. The satyric drama of the Persian trilogy was, as is well known, the Prometheus Πυρφόρος or Πυρκαεύς. That there was a trilogy devoted to Prometheus has been assumed since Welcker, and is perhaps probable. In that case it is natural to suppose that the satyric drama which accompanied the Persians was written before the Promethean trilogy, and in the Πυρκαεύς the poet saw how the subject could be treated in a trilogy. It is not easy to believe that a Promethean trilogy was produced in 473 B. C., with a satyric drama on another theme, while the Πυρκαεύς was put upon the stage a year later. Moreover there is no positive evidence that Aeschylus was in Sicily between 475 and 472 B. C.

The duration of the visit of Aeschylus at Syracuse after the spring of 472, is uncertain. According to Plutarch he was again at Athens in 468, when Sophocles gained his first dramatic victory. The Seven against Thebes was presented in 467. In this latter year Hiero died and his court was in confusion.

If, then, we accept the Pythiad reckoning of Bergk and the

older authorities, there is reason to believe that the Prometheus Bound was written at Syracuse between the autumn of 470 and the early spring of 468 B. C. If we follow the Pythiad reckoning of Boeckh and Dissen, we may believe that it was written between 472 and 468 B. C.